

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/520,426	YAMAGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yong Chu	1626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Yong Chu. (3) _____
 (2) Peter Olexy. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 July 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-5.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yes.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Yong Chu
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Per Mr. Olexy's request, telephonic interview was conducted to discuss the argument and remarks on the Applicants Response dated on 6/16/2006. In re. Bonfil case law was discussed in related to claims 1-2 of the racemic vs stereoisomer. The Examiner thinks the Bonfil case law does not apply to the instant rejection of claims 1-2 under 102(b) because the inherency of the prior art against the instant claims 1-2. Applicants understand the Examiner's point and promise to respond soon.